

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

On page1, line 4 of the Official action, pending claims are listed, but the list omits some claims, namely 2, 4, 5, 10 and 21.

Claims 2, 4, 5 and 10 had previously been objected to. Even though line 6 of the Official action indicates that claims 2, 4 and 5 are being rejected in this Official action, they have not been rejected in the body of the Official action. Nor has claim 10 been rejected.

Previous dependent claim 4 has been rewritten as new independent claim 28, but dependent claim 4 itself is being maintained since claim 1, from which claim 4 ultimately depends, has been amended.

Claim 21 is now being canceled.

Previous claims 8, 11 and 13 which were objected to, have been rewritten as new independent claims 29, 30 and 31, respectively.

It seems that the claims that stand rejected are: 1,3, 6, 7, and 22-24. Of those claims, 1 and 22 are independent and have been amended to distinguish more clearly over the prior art.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that: (i) the spring-loaded element is biased by a spring force acting in a direction of bias (e.g., the spring applies a force to the spring-loaded element 33 or 33A in a vertically downward direction of bias in the preferred embodiment according to Figs. 6-8 and 10), and (ii) the direction of displacement of the spring -loaded element from the recess 21 is substantially opposite the direction of bias (i.e., the direction of displacement in Figs. 6-8 and 10 is vertically upward).

Claim 1 stands rejected over the AAPA (applicants' admitted prior art) of Figs. 1-3 in view of Carroll's spring-loaded element 32. As has been previously pointed out, the balls 32 of Carroll are not actually spring biased. Rather, the spring 51 pushes a collet 18 into a position blocking the movement of the balls 32. The balls 32 do not actually "feel" the bias of the spring.

The present amendments made to claim 1 bring out that difference. That is, the direction of displacement of the spring-loaded element is recited as being substantially opposite to the direction of bias (i.e., vertically upward versus vertically downward, as pointed out above in connection with Figs. 6-8 and 10). Thus, it is a yieldable spring force holds the element within the recess 21 to enable the element to be displaced out of the recess upon the application of a sufficient force to the cutting tool. That is in keeping with the spirit of the present invention wherein the spring-loaded element is not intended to retain the tool in position (the clamp 15 does that), but rather is intended to create a "feel" to the operator as an indication that the cutting tool is actually in one of its preselected positions of adjustment.

In contrast, the spring 51 of Carroll applies a biasing force in an axial direction, but the direction of displacement of the balls 32 is radial. Those directions are not substantially opposite one another, but rather are at ninety degrees to each other. Thus, it is clear that the purpose and functioning of the spring 51 and balls 32 of Carroll is different from that of the presently claimed invention, and such difference is reflected by the structural differences recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 and dependent claims 3, 6 and 7 distinguish patentably over the applied prior art.

Independent claim 22, directed to a tool-clamping device per se, has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1, and it is submitted that claims 22-24 also distinguish over the applied prior art.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: August 17, 2004

By: 

Alan E. Kopecki

Registration No. 25,813

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620